

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the remarks and amendments following is respectfully requested. Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-19 are in this case. Claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-19 have been rejected. Claims 1, 14, and 19 have been amended. Claims 7, 12 and 13 are canceled since its content is now incorporated into claim 1.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections – Pollack

The Examiner has maintained his rejection of claims 14-15 and 17 over USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Pollack (US Patent No. 6,505,236). The rejections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed.

Claim 14 is directed to an e-mail proxy. As clarified by the amended claim, the proxy is a software entity that sits between the client and the e-mail server and communicates with each of the client and e-mail server as if it is the other. That is to say the client communicates with the proxy without requiring any modifications to its basic ability to communicate with a server and indeed it thinks it is communicating with the server. Likewise the e-mail server communicates with the proxy whilst thinking that it is communicating with the client.

This point is brought out in feature b) of claim 14 which recites: "an e-mail proxy in communication with said e-mail server as an e-mail client,"

This feature is further brought out in feature c) of claim 14 which recites:

"an e-mail client in communication with said e-mail proxy for said email server for receiving said formatted message from said email proxy..."

The Examiner quite correctly points out that Pollack teaches an attachment stripper, and the attachment stripper need not be physically part of the e-mail server. However, an attachment stripper, irrespective of whether it is part of another server, is not an e-mail proxy. In order to be an email proxy the client and e-mail server must be able to communicate directly with it as if they were communicating with each other. The attachment stripper of Pollack is in fact an add-on to the email server. The email client in Pollack *does not communicate with the attachment stripper but only with the email server itself*. The attachment is retrieved from storage by clicking on a link, that is to say by using the browser as a client. The attachment stripper of Pollack therefore *does not communicate with the user's email client at all*, and also it only *communicates with the email server as an internal part of the email server, not as if it is the user's email client*. The attachment stripper of Pollack therefore fails the test for being an email proxy.

In more detail, Pollack, as exemplified by Figs 2, 3 and 4 thereof, teaches a network based system for storing attachments of e-mail messages, and a method for storing such attachments. Attachments are stripped from e-mail messages received at an e-mail server, and are stored on a network, such that they can later be accessed by the recipient of the e-mail message. The recipient of the message is notified of the location in which the attachment is stored by the appending to the sent e-mail message a handle connected to the attachment.

Neither this separate storage nor the functionality for stripping the attachment ever communicates with a user client as if it is the email server.

The object of the present invention is to provide a method and system for rapid downloading of e-mail messages containing encoded attachments by a user, by use of an e-mail proxy. The e-mail proxy itself receives the attachment from the e-mail server so that the email server believes it has sent the attachment to the user and that its duty in this regard is fulfilled. The proxy then communicates with the user client which believes it is communicating with the email server, and the proxy then provides the user client with information about the attachment and the option of current or deferred download of the attachment to the recipient.

It is noted parenthetically that the proxy does not necessarily use the same protocol to communicate with the email server and with the user client. In each case it simply uses the most conveniently available protocol that the email server and user client respectively are able to support without modification.

Rapid transmission and downloading of e-mail messages containing attachments is obtained by downloading only the information about the attachments, linking the information within a formatted e-mail message which does not contain the attachment, and downloading the attachment from the e-mail server to the proxy upon request or in the background. The attachment is meanwhile decoded by the proxy so as to reduce its size, and is sent to the user upon request, when the user presses the link appended to the e-mail message that was sent. The user requires no further functionality than his own

unmodified email client, and the email server requires no modification to provide this service. The latter is significant since it means that the proxy can be provided as a service to anyone who desires, without inconveniencing other users of the same email server. The latter is a significant disadvantage of Pollack since the email server in Pollack has to be modified in order to strip and store attachments.

Thus, Applicant feels that claims 14-15 and 17 are novel and non-obvious over Pollack, and are therefore in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections – Pollack in view of Pizano

The Examiner maintains his rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 10-11, 13 and 18 over USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Pollack in view of Pizano (US patent No. 6,105,055). The rejections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is believed to be allowable for the following reasons:

The object of Pollack is given above.

The object of Pizano is to provide a multimedia collaboration system, which combines unique multimedia communications and media processing mechanisms, with components that support information sharing and distribution. The system includes a delayed conference manager connected to a conference database, for archiving, maintaining and managing the information shared and the information related to each of the participating users of the system.

The Examiner states that Pizano teaches downloading e-mail messages and decoding any attachments before transmitting the message or attachment to the user, making reference to column 4, lines 46-47 of Pizano.

However Pollack combined with Pizano fails to teach an email proxy which is communicated with by an email client as if it is an email server, and is communicated with by the email server as if it is an email client. The feature of the email proxy is now clearly recited in claims 1 and 19 as amended.

The use of such an email proxy provides the advantages that neither the user client nor the e-mail server have to be modified, meaning that the system could be applied to certain users of a given email server without affecting other users, or could be applied to requesting users regardless of which email servers they belong to.

Pollack does not teach an email proxy as explained above, and Pizano also does not teach or suggest the use of an email proxy. There is nothing about the combination of Pollack and Pizano that would suggest to the skilled person that there is a missing ingredient, less so that such a missing ingredient is an email proxy.

More specifically, Pizano teaches a multimedia collaboration system in which a newsgroup server, an email server and a web server are all used together in order to allow collaboration by different users for information sharing and distribution. Pizano is not concerned with efficient delivery of email. The use of an email proxy would make no sense in Pizano since the collaboration system requires more than just the email server in order to work.

In fact, Pizano requires that a new e-mail message and a new "post" message must both be sent, the former to the e-mail server and the latter to the newsgroup server (see col 4, lines 41-49). The e-mail message will only be downloaded and the annotation attachment decoded if this condition is true.

An email proxy does not communicate with the newsgroup server and therefore would not know if the above-described condition had been fulfilled. Thus use of an email server to carry out decoding is specifically negated by Pizano.

It is noted here that the annotation attachment is not a regular attachment to an email but is a specific entity which is part of his information system and is produced by his dynamic annotation editor. The encoding thereof has nothing to do with masking control characters from intermediary servers and its decoding does not save a third of the download bandwidth.

In addition, the attachment in Pizano is a system-specific annotation and not a regular email attachment, as explained. Thus there is nothing to suggest that decoding of the attachment of Pizano would lead to any reduction in size of the attachment. On the contrary, decoding usually leads to an increase in size. Thus the advantage given by the decoding as claimed in claim 1 of present invention, namely that the size of the download is reduced by about a third, is simply not present in Pizano. Note that claim 1 has been amended to recite "decoding the at least one attachment to bring about a reduction in the size of the attachment".

There is nothing in Pollack to teach how the problem of the enlargement of the download due to the size of the attachment could be overcome. Thus, even if one of ordinary skill in the art would combine Pollack and Pizano, the resultant combination would not produce any reduction in the size of the attachment and certainly would not lead to the approximately one-third reduction in the overall size of the download which results from decoding the attachment at the proxy.

The decoding taught by the present invention is used for reducing transmission time and bandwidth used, such that an attachment is downloaded to the user in a decoded format, and such that the attachment can be sent and viewed in a streamed manner, as it is already decoded.

Decoding data according to the method of Pizano before sending it in the system taught by Pollack would not help in accelerating the transmission rate, or in saving bandwidth, as the size of the attachment would probably be increased. Furthermore, Pizano further teaches “newly arrived post will not be accessible at the DC manager **18** until the downloading and storing process is completely finished” (column 4, lines 52-54). Therefore, the combination of the two systems would not enable sending data in a streamed manner, and would not result in saving bandwidth or transferring time. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would be discouraged from such a combination following consideration of Pizano.

Thus, Applicant feels that claims 1-6, 8, 10-11, 13 and 18 are novel and non-obvious over Pollack, and are therefore in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections – Pollack and Pizano in view of Dowling

The Examiner rejected claim 9 over USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pollack and Pizano in view of Dowling (US Patent No. 6,574,239). The rejections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 is believed to be allowable as it is dependent on an allowable base claim.

The object of Pollack is given above.

The object of Pizano is given above.

It is added that, Dowling teaches client server communication architectures and fails to teach or suggest the use of proxy servers that sit intermediate a user client and an application server. That is to say, if Dowling were to be combined with Pollack it would still fail to teach the e-mail proxy of present claim 1.

Applicant respectfully concludes that claim 1 is in condition for allowance, and claim 9 is therefore also novel and non-obvious over the above references, alone or in combination.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections – Pollack in view of Slotznick

The Examiner rejected claims 16 over USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Pollack in view of Slotznick (US patent No. 6,011,537). The rejections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed.

Claim 16 is believed to be allowable as being based on an allowable claim 14.

More specifically Slotznick does not teach the use of an email proxy. On the contrary his remote data sources do not appear to be email but rather web data. He teaches no solution to the problem of downloading of email attachments, whether via a proxy or otherwise. Slotznick does teach a system for displaying information at a display of a local user computer, such that the information includes primary information requested by a user, and secondary information including additional information not directly requested by the user. However it does not teach use of an email proxy to download email attachments as if to the user client, but at the same time retain them on the network so that the user client is able to selectively download the attachments.

The object of Pollack is given above.

Applicant respectfully concludes that claim 1 is in condition for allowance, and that claim 16 is therefore also novel and non-obvious over the above references, alone or in combination.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections – Pollack in view of Ubowski

The Examiner rejected claim 19 over USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Pollack in view of Ubowski (US patent No. 6,618,758). The rejections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed.

Claim 19 has been clarified to teach an email proxy that communicates with an email server as if it is the email client so that the server believes it is downloading the entire email message with attachment to the client. The email proxy further communicates with the email client as if it is the email server, so that the email client believes it is being offered the choice for downloading the attachment directly from the email server. As a result no modification is needed of the email client or of the email server. A service to provide separate downloading of attachments is available to any user who requests it regardless of what server he uses or what email client he uses. No such possibility is taught or suggested either in Pollack or in Ubowski.

The object of Pollack is given above.

The object of Ubowski is a system for using a menu downloaded from a server to select files or portions thereof for downloading from the server. The user is able to select which parts of the file to download based on the menu. There is no mention of email, no mention of an email server, no mention of an email client, and no mention of an email proxy. There is mention of a server storing files, but there is no proxy of any kind. The menu in Ubowski is sent directly to the user.

The user of Ubowski would therefore require modification of his user client in order to manage the menus, thus negating the advantage of the present invention.

By contrast, in the present invention, a clear separation is provided between an e-mail server and an e-mail proxy, as noted above and as now clarified in the amended claim. Also as exhaustively explained above, the handle generator of Pollack is not an e-mail proxy because it does not fulfill the same functions. Ubowski does not have a proxy and therefore requires modification of the user client.

Therefore, even assuming that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine these references, the combination would not result in the present invention because the combination does not teach the use of an email proxy. This is inventive because without a proxy there is no teaching of how to provide selective downloading of attachments without modifying the user client.

The combination of Pollack and Ubowski would therefore not result in the present invention as claimed in claim 19.

Thus, Applicant feels that claim 19 is novel and non-obvious over Pollack and Ubowski, alone or in combination.

In view of the above remarks and amendments it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-19 are now in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

present invention because the combination does not teach the use of an email proxy. This is inventive because without a proxy there is no teaching of how to provide selective downloading of attachments without modifying the user client.

The combination of Pollack and Ubowski would therefore not result in the present invention as claimed in claim 19.

Thus, Applicant feels that claim 19 is novel and non-obvious over Pollack and Ubowski, alone or in combination.

In view of the above remarks and amendments it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-6, 8-11 and 13-19 are now in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Martin O. Moynihan
Martin Moynihan,
Registration No. 40,338

Date: August 22, 2005